



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/182,842 10/29/98 BEHL

S BEHL1318

021366 MMC2/0622
LAW OFFICES OF KEVIN H FORTIN
TWIN OAKS OFFICE PLAZA SUITE 112
477 NINTH AVENUE
SAN MATEO CA 94402

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED:

06/22/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/182842

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5-30-00 (4m 5-26)
- ☒ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13, 14 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13, 14 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on 5-30-00 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved. except as noted in the letter.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received:

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

The new abstract is objected to, it should be rewritten on a "separate page" and without underlining and brackets which are only for use in claims.

Page 2, line 13 "16" should be --26--. Page 4, line 24, after "64" --,see figure 4-- should be added.

Claim 1, line 5, change to read --...at least two PC cards,...-- is suggested for consistency with line 9 which requires "two PC card slots"; on line 7, 13. Claim 10 "a" should be --the--.

The amendment filed May 30 2000 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: The fig. 2 depiction of the fan 66 mounted on a side wall of the carrier lacks support in the original disclosure. The fan could be shown as in fig. 3.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office action.

07-289

Figs. 3, 4 are objected to, if connector 48 is on carrier 32 in fig. 3, it should ^{not} ~~be~~ also be shown on part 62 in fig. 4. These connectors, it is believed, should properly be shown and numbered as separate members.

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Art Unit: 2839

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Cheng.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Darden.

For claim 13 the references are applied as discussed in the last Office action. The reference are sufficiently analogous that if heat were a problem in the ^{main} reference systems, it would have been obvious to use a plug-in fan of the Cheng type. See Darden, fig. 1 computer 6 which is comparable in structure to the Cheng computer 10.

Claims 1-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai taken in view of Shieh, Darden, Cheng and Heung.

The patents are applied as discussed previously. It also would have been obvious to include a fan in the Tsai assembly in view of Cheng and Heung. This would provide cooling of the Tsai fig. 4 computer.

Claims 1-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Darden, Tsai, Cheng and Heung.

It would have been obvious to provide the prior art carrier 12 with a fan in view of Heung and Cheng to enable cooling of the assembly. Darden and Tsai are applied as in the last office action. In addition whether carrier 12 is to be used for a hard drive 26 ^{or} for receiving PC cards is seen to have been an obvious variation since such PC card receivers are well known. In either

Art Unit: 2839

case to add a fan to the carrier would have been an obvious change. Note that the Heung module 14 includes a fan along with various electrical systems.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Arguments as to claim 13 are responded to above. For the claims 1-12 rejection, note that arguments are only to addition of the fan. It is submitted that use of a fan in the Tsai or prior art carriers would have an obvious variation ^{if} ~~of~~ cooling were desired.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2839

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

Abrams/dc
June 19, 2000


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322